Ham-Digital Digest   Mon, 7 Feb 94   Volume 94 : Issue   28

Today's Topics:
                        219 Committee Report
                             Microwave
                         PK-232 vs 1278 ??
     Some dumb questions that I hope someone will take a shot at
                         subscribe (2 msgs)
                  TEMPEST - Electronic Eavesdropping

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 4 Feb 1994 19:11:32 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!pdh@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: 219 Committee Report
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

brian@nothing (Brian Kantor) writes:

>The band plan, as set forth, requires nothing less than 56kb, and because
>of its bandwidth and explicit 'signalling rate' restrictions, prohibits
>anything above 56kb. Looks like we're going to have a 56kb network, folks.
>Hope that's fast enough for you, dude.

Basically, they picked the speed and we are stuck with it, even if we have
means to go to higher data rates in the same bandwidth, right?

>And get a load of the administrative requirements! For the first time,

>NON-Repeater operations will have to apply for a COORDINATED SANCTION before
>they can go on the air. There's a bunch of beaurocratic hoopage to jump
>through before operation is to be permitted; it seems to me that this is
>more in keeping with a fee-for-service commercial data highway than an
>experimental radio service such as hams have traditionally been.

Actually the data network proposed seems to be just that kind of thing.
Maybe we need to consider what is the proposed usage compared to what
ham radio is supposed to be.

>Couple that with the latest proposal that indemnifies ham frequency
>coordinating bodies from lawsuits and redress, and you've got the
>thin end of the wedge for sure. How long after this gets adopted do we
>wait for a proposal to allocate specific frequencies for, say, NTS Nets
>on 40 meters? What difference is there between that and what is
>proposed here?

A few years?

>Should we just let NABER handle the coordination?

Oddly enough, it makes sense. Shows what ham radio is becoming.

>We should see how this turns out in the NPRM, and be sure to comment
>upon it vigorously.

Agreed.

Now where did I put that 900 MHz band plan?
--
Phil Howard KA9WGN | "It is good to keep a gun for peaceful purposes,
pdh@netcom.com | not for aggression" --Mikhail Kalashnikov,
"If I was able to fix it, | designer of the Avtomat Kalashnikova 1947, while
it must have been broken" | at the Dallas 1994 Shot Show, Wed 12 Jan 1994.

Date: 4 Feb 1994 10:04:26 GMT
From: digex.net!access1!sheerpan@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Microwave
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Hi. I'm planning a microwave data link between two schools and wondered
if anyone had any advice. I'm using a plan from a ARRL handbook (it
escapes me which right now) which runs a 2megabit balanced and a voice

channel. Any hints on aiming, etc?

Date: Sun, 6 Feb 1994 18:08:34 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!slay@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: PK-232 vs 1278 ??
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

: Why do the cognoscenti here prefer the KAM, anyway?

Well, I've used (or rather - TRIED to use) the PK-232 and was totally
frustrated by it. I do OWN and USE the MFJ-1278, a TNC-2, and a KAM.
I bought all the machines but was given the KAM by another ham. My
favorite machine is definitely the KAM for a simple reason. I am a DXer
and Contester. Of the machines mentioned, only the KAM is dual-port
meaning that I can operate V/UHF packet (i.e. PacketCluster) at the
SAME TIME that I am operating HF digital modes. For me, that is the
primary reason why I prefer the KAM. If the MFJ-1278 was a dual-port
machine, I would probably prefer that one.

Cheers de Sandy WA6BXH/7J1ABV   WA6BXH@N0ARY   slay@netcom.com

----

Date: Wed, 2 Feb 1994 12:49:08 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!
cauldron!ra.csc.ti.com!fstop.csc.ti.com!sbrown@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Some dumb questions that I hope someone will take a shot at
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb1.124509.3349@mallrc.mala.bc.ca> wagner@mala.bc.ca (TOM WAGNER,
Wizzard of old Audio/Visual Equipment........Nanaimo Campus) writes:

> In article <2ik91nINN932@grumpy.symantec.com>, Alan K. Adamson
<aadamson@symantec.com> writes:
> > Ok, I have read some articles metioning digital regenerating repeaters.
> > Anyone
> > want to take a stab at a laymans defintion? What are we talking about
> > here.

> Are you perchance refering to Digipeater use. This is a system
> whereby you can use another packet system as a repeater. It is
> quite handy to extend the range to which you can communicate. My
> system (baycom) works as an excellent digi- peater. Basically I
> place a call to my final QSO by using any reasonable number of
> friends packet units. They recieve my call and pass it on to
> another repeater who passes it on..... well you know, till it gets

> to the final repeater.

Don't think that is what a digital regenerating repeater is.
Digipeaters tend to be an operating mode of every packeteer's setup.
I believe that digital regenerating repeaters are more along the lines
of 2M FM repeaters, for example, in that they are located at some
central point with a view to maximum coverage, etc. I speculate that
they receive on one frequency, recover the bits, send them to another
modem, the output of which gets applied to a transmitter on another
frequency. I would also guess that most of them are supported by
groups of people rather than individuals.

Perhaps someone like Bdale will tell us what they _really_ are.

```
            *********************************************
            |   Steve Brown, WD5HCY          |          |
            |   sbrown@charon.dseg.ti.com    | Simplicate |
            |   wd5hcy@wd5hcy.ampr.org       | and add    |
            |        [44.28.0.61]            | lightness. |
            |   wd5hcy@kf5mg.#dfw.tx.usa.na  |            |
            *********************************************
```

Date: 7 Feb 94 01:15:51 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: subscribe
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

subscribe brian greiner

--
Brian Greiner
internet   bgreiner@accesspt.north.net
CompuServe 72727,2041
Ham Radio   VE3SPZ@VE3YRA

Date: 7 Feb 94 10:23:55
From: Max Wheatley <max@acme.gen.nz>
Subject: subscribe
To: ham-digital-digest@ucsd.edu

add max@acme.gen.nz

Date: 6 Feb 1994 21:19:37 -0500
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!usc!yeshua.marcam.com!
zip.eecs.umich.edu!montego!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: TEMPEST - Electronic Eavesdropping
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <2j3m8h$m6j@percy.cs.bham.ac.uk>,
Rob Jackson <roj@cs.bham.ac.uk> wrote:
>
>In the US it not illegal to posess TEMPEST-surveillance equipment but
>it is illegal to take appropriate counter-measures to prevent
>surveillance. The US government has refused to release details of its
>TEMPEST research and has restricted the dissemination of independent
>research by classifying it.

    In no way does that equate to it being illegal to attempt to
suppress spurious electromagnetic radiation from computing devices. The
FCC even has rules requiring EMI/RFI filtering & suppression for
civillian & commercial computers & peripherals, albeit not in the name
of national security.

>The US Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) makes use of
>TEMPEST secured
>electronics and computers as they believe that the drug cartels may
>possess surveillance equipment.
>
    Yes & no. Some DEA processing machines contain or are capable of
accessing classified information. That alone requires the machines and/or
their containing room to meet certain TEMPEST criteria. The classified
info is what necessitates TEMPEST, and not specifically the belief that
narcotic organizations are using Van Eck devices, etc.

--
 Tim Tyler   Internet: tim@ais.org Packet: KA8VIR @WB8ZPN.#SEMI.MI.USA.NA
P.O. Box 443   C$erve:72571,1005 GEnie:Sneaker AOL:Hooligan MCI: 442-5735
Ypsilanti MI   "I'm just an innocent little frog, trying to
  48197   hop my way across the Information Superhighway"

Date: Sat, 5 Feb 1994 22:03:56 +0000
From: spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!demon!fusk.demon.co.uk!
db@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <2ik91nINN932@grumpy.symantec.com>,

<1994Feb1.124509.3349@mallrc.mala.bc.ca>, <SBROWN.94Feb2064908@charon.dseg.ti.com>
Subject : Re: Some dumb questions that I hope someone will take a shot at

I have been involved in the setting up of a 9600 baud digital regenerating
repeater. In our implementation we also regenerate the transmit clock to
remove any phase jitter from the incoming signal and delay the data by a few
bits to give the transmitter time to key up.

Mail me if you'd like more information.

Regards, Dave G6GZH

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #28
****